

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/577,457

Applicant(s)
Pierson et al.

Examiner
Lynne Gurley

Art Unit
2812



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lynne A. Gurley

(3) _____

(2) John A. Jordan

(4) _____

Date of Interview Aug 8, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-22

Identification of prior art discussed:
Not Applicable.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

A restriction requirement was made by the Examiner between device claims 1-13 and method claims 14-22. The device claims 1-13 were elected. Restriction requirement is attached.

8/14/02

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Lynne A. Gurley
LYNNE GURLEY
PATENT EXAMINER
Art Unit 2812

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 2812

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 14-22, drawn to a method of making a semiconductor device, classified in class 438, subclass 612 .
 - II. Claims 1-13, drawn to a semiconductor device, classified in class 257, subclass 735+.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process, ie a process which does not require second solder bumps.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. During a telephone conversation with John A. Jordan on 8/8/02 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, device claims 1-13. Affirmation of

Art Unit: 2812

this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 14-22 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).